

the history of Jekyll Island, which is a barrier island off the coast of Georgia.

In 1947, Jekyll was purchased by the State of Georgia. In 1950, the State legislature enacted a law that said 65 percent of the island would stay in its preserved and natural state and only 35 percent of it would be developed. The 35 percent of it was developed in the 1960s and 1970s, long before the CBRA law about flood insurance and the Coastal Barrier Resource Act.

The State has maintained that 35/65 percent split; and all the 35 percent is, in fact, built out. Yet, somewhere along the line, it got included in the CBRA law, which made it the case that residents could no longer get flood care, which was not the point of the law at all.

We found out about this in 2003, when Walter Alexander, a resident of Jekyll Island, had his duplex burned down. He was cleaning up the land and preparing to rebuild his structure when he found out he could not get Federal flood insurance, and that was because of a quirk that happened in 1990. And we have been working on this since 2003 trying to get this exemption from the flood insurance law so that the people on Jekyll Island could in fact go back to getting flood care the way they had it.

So this has been something we have been working on for a long time. A lot of people had been involved in it, and I certainly want to thank Chairman POMBO and Subcommittee Chairman GILCREST, and Edith Thompson, who is on the staff; and Harry Burroughs, who is the staff director for Mr. GILCREST; and folks like Bill Donahue and Laura Bonds, who are with the Jekyll Island Authority back home. Also, Pat Wilson, with the Georgia Department of Natural Resources, and Commissioner Noel Holcomb, Becky Kelly and Susan Shipman; and the Fish and Wildlife folks and the residents and businesses on Jekyll Island.

We have all worked on this in a collaborative effort. There has not been any opposition on this. Democrats, Republicans, and environmentalists. I would say developers, but developers have not been at the table since all this has already been developed for now about 30 or 40 years.

But I just wanted to say this is a very good day for the folks on Jekyll Island, and I thank both of you for allowing me to speak up about this issue.

Before I get into specifics of my bill I want to thank everyone who has helped in the lengthy process to bring this bill to the floor.

Thank you to Chairmen POMBO and GILCREST and their staff, specifically Edith Thompson (Gilcrest) and Harry Burroughs (Staff Director for Gilcrest subcommittee but Pombo person). Also Merritt Meyers and Rob Asbell from our office.

Thank you to the Jekyll Island Authority—the relentless work of Bill Donahue and Laura Bonds, the Governor's office with assistance from Pat Wilson, the Georgia Department of Natural Resources (Commissioner Noel Holcomb, Becky Kelly and Susan Shipman), the

Fish and Wildlife Service and the residents and businesses on Jekyll Island.

History: 1947—Jekyll Island purchased by the State from the Jekyll Island Club; 1950—Georgia General Assembly enacted a law that assured 65 percent of the Island would be preserved and protected in its natural state and managed for future generations to enjoy while 35 percent be developed to render the Island as self-supporting.

The 35 percent of the island that could be developed largely was during the 1960s and early 1970s—long before the original CBRA.

The State, working through state laws has moved to aggressively create a balance among development, public access and education and conservation long before Jekyll Island was included in the CBRS and that balance is now in jeopardy as redevelopment is critical to the viability of the Island.

If anything, Jekyll Island should be the model for the rest of the U.S. to use for the coexistence of development and conservation and quite honestly the dependence of one on the other.

I was contacted by Jekyll Island resident, Walter Alexander in 2003 because his duplex burned down. As Mr. Alexander began cleaning up the land and planning for replacing the structure he found out that he could not obtain Federal Flood Insurance, the insurance he must have in order to get a mortgage—and private flood insurance was prohibitively expensive for him.

He contacted the Jekyll Island Authority and together they began researching and found out that Jekyll Island in its entirety was included as an Otherwise Protected Area within the CBRS in 1990. The situation became even more urgent when he saw that in his original lease if he did not rebuild within 2 years he could lose the land.

Almost immediately after the fire Mr. Alexander started receiving offers to purchase the lot lease from wealthy individuals that could build the house without having to take out a mortgage. He turned down these offers because he wanted to stay close to his family who all lived on the Island.

Mr. Alexander is a nurse, and does not have a salary that allows him to rebuild without a mortgage—he was finally forced to take drastic action and borrow money against the equity in his parent's home so he could begin construction—this greatly reduces their family security during retirement. He is using this money to rebuild a duplex that not only meets, but exceeds FEMA regulations for flooding.

This is but one example of what denying insurance for rebuilding a community developed in the 1960s does—this is not what CBRS original intent was.

Arguments: (1) Jekyll Island should not have been included in 1990 on the CBRS maps as an OPA because it was “developed” long before it was included in the system; (2) prior to the inclusion, the Governor and the Department of Natural Resources of Georgia objected to the inclusion of Jekyll Island in the System; (3) the inclusion of Jekyll Island runs counter to congressional intent as OPA's were to include only Undeveloped lands held for conservation; and (4) the inclusion of Jekyll Island runs counter to State intent as 35 percent of the island by Georgia law must be developed, and is necessary to be developed to render the Island self-supporting.

Need for Change: I strongly believe that if the 35 percent of the island that is developed

is not removed from the CBRS the long term integrity of the system will be harmed.

If the original intent of the Act was to preserve undeveloped coastal barrier islands then I think leaving Jekyll Island in, in its entirety would set a bad precedence for the CBRS.

This legislation removes land from the Coastal Barrier Resources System, specifically from a unit that should not have been created in the first place since it was neither undeveloped nor held for conservation purposes.

The Fish and Wildlife Service supports my bill and the new map associated with it that removes 35 percent of Jekyll Island from CBRA.

Leaving the 35 percent of Jekyll which has long been developed in the CBRS would ultimately do two things: (1) the Island would turn into a run down shanty town with deteriorating houses and businesses. It would lose its allure to tourists across the world and would ultimately become a burden to the State since it would no longer be self-sustaining or (2) it would again become a playground for only the rich and famous who could afford the costly Lloyds of London flood insurance required to build, maintain, repair and update all structures on the island—and that is not fair to the hardworking tax-paying people who currently call Jekyll Island home or inexpensive vacation spot.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 138, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COASTAL BARRIER RESOURCES SYSTEM MAP REPLACEMENT RELATING TO GRAYTON BEACH, FLORIDA

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 479) to replace a Coastal Barrier Resources System map relating to Coastal Barrier Resources System Grayton Beach Unit FL-95P in Walton County, Florida, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 479

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. REPLACEMENT OF COASTAL BARRIER RESOURCES SYSTEM MAP RELATING TO GRAYTON BEACH UNIT FL-95P IN WALTON COUNTY, FLORIDA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The map described in subsection (b) relating to the Coastal Barrier Resources System unit Grayton Beach Unit FL-95P, located in Walton County, Florida, as included in the set of maps entitled “Coastal Barrier Resources System” referred to in section 4(a) of the Coastal Barrier Resources Act (16 U.S.C. 3503(a)), is hereby replaced by another map relating to that unit entitled “Grayton Beach Unit FL-95P and Draper Lake Unit FL-96” and dated “July 24, 2006”.

(b) REPLACED MAP DESCRIBED.—The map replaced under subsection (a) is subtitled

"COASTAL BARRIER RESOURCES SYSTEM GRAYTON BEACH UNIT FL-95P DRAPER LAKE UNIT FL-96" and dated October 24, 1990.

(c) AVAILABILITY.—The Secretary of the Interior shall keep the maps referred to in subsections (a) on file and available for inspection in accordance with the provisions of section 4(b) of the Coastal Barrier Resources Act (16 U.S.C. 3503(b)).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 479 corrects several Florida mapping mistakes implemented in the enactment of the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990. Under current law, only Congress can add or delete property from the Coastal Barrier Resources System. Under the bill, 20 acres of privately held land would be removed from the system, ensuring that the affected homeowners are eligible for Federal flood insurance in the future.

We would be making this change because this property was mistakenly included within an Otherwise Protected Area unit. It was designated based on the faulty assumption that this property was included within the boundaries of the Grayton Beach State Park and that the land was undeveloped. In fact, a number of those lots were fully developed with homes constructed by 1983; and, therefore, this property does not qualify for inclusion in the system.

With the Federal Flood Insurance Program experiencing a large number of claims, Congress should be cautious about providing access to additional beneficiaries. However, in this case, H.R. 479 satisfies the threshold of fixing legitimate mapping mistakes.

In addition, the new corrected map will add almost 1,600 acres of State parkland that was inadvertently left out of the unit when it was created in 1990. The net effect of this technical correction is that we expand the system by 1,562 acres of fastland and wetland habitat.

I would urge an "aye" vote on H.R. 479.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. GRIJALVA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, this legislation has been championed by our

colleague from Florida, ALLEN BOYD, without whose efforts it would not be on the floor today; and I want to thank him for that.

The majority has already adequately explained the bill. I would only note that the expansion of this Coastal Barrier Resource Unit will significantly increase the total area of lands that will now become ineligible for Federal flood insurance.

And because this region of the Florida panhandle is experiencing a frenzy of coastal development, this factor was a pivotal consideration in the committee's approval of H.R. 479.

The net conservation benefit in this instance was considered sufficient to protect the integrity of this coastal barrier unit, despite the strong reservations of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to remove some small areas of private land from the existing unit.

We on this side of the aisle do not object to this legislation.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of my bill, H.R. 479, which creates a new Coastal Barriers Resources Map, removing the Old Miller Place Subdivision from the Otherwise Protected Area. I would like to thank Mr. POMBO and the Resources Committee for their hard work and commitment to this bill.

I will provide a little bit of background for my colleagues: Old Miller Place has been privately owned since the 1890s. The Miller family homesteaded it in 1903. The first residence was built in 1981 and the fourth was completed in 1985. Six lots remained unbuilt by 1990 because they were purchased for future retirement homes by their respective owners. In 2006, they lay bare as they await restoration of their right to build.

Old Miller Place was platted and developed in 1979, 6 years before the State of Florida's land acquisition program joined Grayton Beach State Park with the southern and eastern boundaries of Old Miller Place in 1985. In 1990, a layer of Federal protection was overlaid on part of Grayton Beach State Park when Congress expanded the Coastal Barrier Resources System to include areas known as "Otherwise Protected Areas (OPA)." In the case of Unit FL-95P, the otherwise protected area is Grayton Beach State Park. At the time of its creation in 1990, OPA Unit FL-95P included only about half of the 2,238 acres of Grayton Beach State Park and the entire 6.4 acre private-property subdivision known as the Old Miller Place.

Mr. Speaker, on paper this bill is a technical correction, but for the property owners in Old Miller Place Subdivision this bill means greater opportunity and freedom. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 479.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my concern with two bills to be considered under the suspension of the rules today: H.R. 138 and H.R. 479. These two bills would remove land from the Coastal Barrier Resources System, CBRS.

Created by the Coastal Barrier Resources Act of 1982, CBRA, CBRS is a Reagan-era free-market conservation program that denies Federal subsidies to development in certain coastal areas. It was created with three goals: to reduce risk to people and property, to discourage development in ecologically sensitive

coastal barrier islands, and to save taxpayers from having to pay for building and rebuilding in high-risk areas. The program included 450,000 acres of coastal barrier islands in 1982 and was expanded to nearly 1.3 million acres in 1990. A unique program, CBRA doesn't preclude development; it just ensures that the Federal Government does not subsidize construction in inherently risky, environmentally fragile areas. This has been a highly successful program: a 2002 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service report estimated that the CBRS will save taxpayers more than \$1.2 billion by 2010. In addition, at a time when our Nation has been losing our precious, fragile coastal ecosystems at an alarming rate to both development and coastal erosion, this program has discouraged development in those areas.

I believe that Congress should be working to expand this highly successful program and using its free-market approach as a model for other legislation. This is why I am disappointed that during my time in Congress I have only seen us moving in the wrong direction. The program has been slowly experiencing death by a thousand cuts. It has been more than 15 years since Congress added land to the system, and each Congress brings another set of technical corrections that remove acreage from the program. Even though most of these "boundary adjustments" are small, much of the land is ecologically significant.

I hope that my colleagues will join me during the next session of Congress in looking for ways to improve and expand federal programs to discourage development in ecologically sensitive and hazardous areas. Unfortunately, it appears that we have chosen to observe the anniversary of Hurricane Katrina, a painful reminder of the dangers of development in disaster-prone areas, by weakening a program that has been proven to save lives, money, and the environment.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 479, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL FISH HATCHERY SYSTEM VOLUNTEER ACT OF 2006

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5381) to establish a volunteer program and promote community partnerships for the benefit of national fish hatcheries and fisheries program offices, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5381

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,